PRESENT:—*cont.*

Srinivasan, Rao Bahadur R.
Sriramulu, Mr. G.
Subbarayan, Dr. P.
Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.
Subrahmanyam Chetti, Rao Sahib P.
Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T.
Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.
Thomas, Mr. Daniel.
Vasudeva Pillai, Mr. V. G.
Vedachala Mudaliyar, Mr. M.
Venkataramayya, Rao Sahib B.
Waddington, Mr. H.
Watson, I.C.S., Mr. H. A.
Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Yakub Hassan Sahib Bahadur.
Zamindar of Chemudu.
Zamindar of Ettayapuram.

I.—SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. F. G. LUKER made the oath of allegiance to the Crown and then took his seat.

II.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Police

Alleged lathi charge at Udipi on 26th January 1931.

*625 Q.—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there was a lathi charge on or about the 26th January 1931 in Udipi;

(*b*) if the answer is in the affirmative what are the circumstances leading up to the said lathi charge;

(*c*) what is the number of people wounded and what is the nature of the wounds inflicted on the persons during the said lathi charge;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that a Muhammadan youth received severe injuries as a consequence of the said lathi charge and is in a precarious condition; if so, in what condition he is, and what is the nature of his wounds and his age;

(*e*) what action the Government propose to take in the matter; and

(*f*) if the Government have no information, whether they will be pleased to call for the same?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) On the evening of the 26th January 1931 a procession of about 100 satyagrahis started from Kalsanka and marched towards the temple square singing so-called national slogans and crying 'Gandhi-ki-Jai'. The procession was held up at Badagapett by the Sub-Inspector of Police as it was in defiance of an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, in force in Udipi. The Inspector of Police, Udipi Circle, who had by then arrived on the spot warned the processionists in Kanarese that they constituted an unlawful assembly as they were taking out a procession in violation of the order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, and ordered them to disperse. The processionists did not disperse. The Inspector thereupon arrested nine persons who were the leaders and put them in a car. The other processionists then surrounded the car and would not allow it to proceed. The

Inspector again warned the processionists to disperse; they refused to disperse and the Inspector thereon dispersed them with force.

(c) The Government have no information as to the number of persons who may have been injured during the course of the dispersal. No person was, so far as their information goes, seriously injured.

(d) It was reported by the District Magistrate that a Muhammadan boy (age unknown) was knocked down during the course of the dispersal and sustained an injury to the head. He was at once removed to the hospital and so far as Government are aware is not in a precarious condition.

(e) None.

(f) The Government have given such information as they have from the report of the District Magistrate made soon after the incident occurred.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know, Sir, as to whether the responsibility of the police ceases with the beating?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"May I once again suggest, Sir, that we may let bygones be bygones, especially after the settlement between the Government and the Congress. I may say that I shall try to give such information as I have got on these matters, but I think it would be better that both the Government and the Opposition should now turn their attention to the constructive work in regard to the future constitution of India."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know, Sir, in view of the reply that has just been given by the hon. the Home Member, whether the Government of India is not going into the question of excesses on the part of the police? It may be that the Local Government may have to answer questions on the subject, and so these facts may be brought out, and then it will be opportune enough to adopt the suggestion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"That question has been answered by the Government of India already."

Alleged lathi charge at Udipi on 26th January 1931.

*626 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) what the number of the reserve police who were taken to Udipi on the night of the 26th January was, how long they were kept there and for what purpose; and

(b) whether any enquiry has been made regarding the necessity for the use of lathi that day and the circumstances connected with the beating of the Muhammadan boy who got mixed up in the crowd of on-lookers?

A.—(a) The Government are aware that the District Superintendent of Police had to despatch a body of the reserve police to Udipi as a precaution against breaches of the peace. There is however no information as to the strength of the force or as to how long it was kept in Udipi.